



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Cev
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/647,255	08/26/2003	Gerard Vergnaud	Q76973	3044
23373	7590	01/25/2007	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			KEEFER, MICHAEL E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2109	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	01/25/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/647,255	VERGNAUD ET AL.
	Examiner Michael E. Keefer	Art Unit 2112

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 26 August 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/26/2003.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is responsive to the Application filed on 8/26/2003.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

In line 8 of page 5, the word "is" should be deleted.

The specification is missing the following sub-titles:

Background of the invention, including Field of Invention and Description
of Related Art

Brief Summary of the Invention

Brief Description of the Drawings

Detailed Description of the Invention

The specification also is missing the section "Brief Description of the Drawings" which provides an outline with a short description of each figure in the application.

The following guideline is provided for applicant's use:

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.

- (1) Field of the Invention.
- (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Appropriate correction is required.

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of the use of the words "means" and "said".

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure:

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

4. A series of singular dependent claims is permissible in which a dependent claim refers to a preceding claim which, in turn, refers to another preceding claim.

A claim which depends from a dependent claim should not be separated by any claim which does not also depend from said dependent claim. It should be kept in mind that a dependent claim may refer to any preceding independent claim. In general, applicant's sequence will not be changed. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

Applicant's attention is drawn to claim 9, which depends on claim 6, which in turn depends on claim 1. Claim 9 is separated from claim 6 by claims 7 and 8 that do not depend upon claim 6.

Applicant's attention is also drawn to claim 35, which is dependent on claim 32, which is dependent on claim 28. Claim 35 is separated from claim 32 by claims 33 and 34 that do not depend upon claim 32.

5. Claims 1-20, 24-42 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Regarding **claim 1**, it is suggested that the phrase "user terminals (8)" be deleted from line 1, and that the phrase --to user terminals (8),-- be added after the word (WLAN) in line 2 to improve the clarity of the claim.

It is further suggested that in line 2, it is suggested that the word "which" be deleted and replaced with the word --said-- to improve the clarity of the claim.

Regarding **claims 2-20**, it is suggested that the phrase "A server" in line 1 be deleted and replaced with the phrase --The server-- to improve the clarity of the claim.

Regarding **claim 2**, it is suggested that the word “the” in line 2 be deleted and replaced with the word --a-- to improve the clarity of the claim.

It is further suggested that the word “of” be deleted and replaced with the word --for-- to improve the clarity of the claim.

It is additionally suggested that the phrase --of said-- be inserted between “each” and “terminal” to improve the clarity of the claim.

Regarding **claim 6**, it appears that this claim was intended to depend from claim 5 due to the recitation of “primary or secondary MAC address”, therefore it is suggested that the number “4” in line 1 be deleted and replaced with the number --5--.

It is suggested that the word --extracted-- be inserted between “said” and “MAC” in line 7 to improve the clarity of the claim.

It is further suggested that the phrase “a primary” in line 2 be deleted and replaced with the phrase --one of said primary-- to improve the clarity of the claim.

It is additionally suggested that the word “address” in line 3 be deleted and replaced with the word --addresses-- to improve the clarity of the claim.

Regarding **claim 8**, it is suggested that the word --second-- be inserted between “said” and “terminals” in line 1 to improve the clarity of the claim.

Regarding **claim 9**, it is suggested that the word “the” in line 2 be deleted and replaced with the word --a-- to improve the clarity of the claim.

It is further suggested that the word “the” in line 4 be deleted and replaced with the word --a-- to improve the clarity of the claim.

Regarding **claim 10**, it is suggested that the word --said-- be inserted between the words “for” and “allocation” in line 2 to improve the clarity of the claim.

It is further suggested that the word “chosen” in line 4 be deleted and replaced with the phrase --at least one-- to improve the clarity of the claim.

Regarding **claim 11**, it is suggested that the word “the” in line 1 be deleted and replaced with the word --a-- to improve the clarity of the claim.

It is further suggested that the word “said” in line 2 be deleted and replaced with the word --a-- to improve the clarity of the claim.

It is additionally suggested that the phrase --of said-- be inserted between “one” and “priority” in line 2.

It is also suggested that the word “level.” in line 2 be deleted and replaced with the word “levels.” to improve the clarity of the claim.

Regarding **claim 13**, it is suggested that the word “said” in line 3 be deleted to improve the clarity of the claim.

It is further suggested that the word “chosen” in line 4 be deleted and replaced with the phrase --at least one-- to improve the clarity of the claim.

It is additionally suggested that the phrase “address is” in line 4 be deleted and replaced with the phrase --addresses are-- to improve the clarity of the claim.

Regarding **claim 27**, it is suggested that the phrase --of said-- be inserted between the words "each" and "first" in line 1 to improve the clarity of the claim.

It is further suggested that the phrase --of said-- be inserted between the words "each" and "second" in line 3.

Regarding **claim 28**, it is suggested that the word "which" in line 2 be deleted and replaced with the word "the" to improve the clarity of the claim.

It is further suggested that the phrase "is characterized in that it consists in:" be deleted and replaced with the phrase "consisting of:" to improve the clarity of the claim.

Regarding **claims 29-42**, it is suggested that the phrase "A method" in line 1 be deleted and replaced with the phrase --The method-- to improve the clarity of the claim.

Regarding **claim 30**, it is suggested that the word "chosen" in line 3 be deleted and replaced with the phrase --at least one-- to improve the clarity of the claim.

Regarding **claim 32**, it appears that this claim was intended to depend from claim 31 due to the recitation of "primary or secondary MAC address", therefore it is suggested that the number "30" in line 1 be deleted and replaced with the number --31--.

It is suggested that the word --extracted-- be inserted between "said" and "MAC" in line 5 to improve the clarity of the claim.

It is further suggested that the phrase “a primary” in line 2 be deleted and replaced with the phrase --one of said primary-- to improve the clarity of the claim.

It is additionally suggested that the word “address” in line 2 be deleted and replaced with the word --addresses-- to improve the clarity of the claim.

Regarding **claim 34**, it is suggested that the word “n” in line 1 be deleted and replaced with the word --in-- to improve the clarity of the claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-20 and 28-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding **claim 1**, which is directed to a processing server for allocating user terminals resources of a network. In order for a claim to be considered statutory it must be directed to one of the statutory categories of invention (process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter). In this case the claim is solely directed to software as stated in applicant's specification on page 16-17, the control module and allocation module can take the form of software. Since the control module (or means) is the only claimed structure of the processing server, and the control means is drawn to solely software, the claim as a whole is non-statutory as being drawn to software, per se.

Claims, 2-3 and 10-20, which are dependent on claim 1, fail to add any statutory structure to the claim and thus are rejected for the same.

Regarding **claim 28**, which is drawn towards a method of allocating resources of a local area network. In order for a claim to be statutory it must have a useful, concrete and tangible result. Since the method contains an "if" clause (in the case of an attempt at setting up a connection with said local area network (WLAN) by a terminal), both prongs of the if must have a useful, concrete and tangible result. In the case where no terminal attempts to set up a connection with the local area network there is no result at all, therefore the claim is non-statutory as it lacks a useful, tangible, and concrete result.

Claims 29-42, which are dependent on claim 28, fail to address the situation where no terminal attempts to set up a connection with the local area network, therefore are rejected for the same.

7. **Claims 43-44** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 43-44 provides for the use of a method, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process

applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1-16, 21-23, 25, and 27-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hagen (US 2002/0075844 A1) and Schneider et al. (US 6408336 B1) hereafter Schneider.

Regarding **claims 1 and 28** Hagen discloses:

A processing server (Network Access Server 7, Fig. 1) for allocating user terminals (user terminal 1, Fig. 1) resources of a local area network (LAN 10, Fig. 1), which server is adapted to be connected to at least one local area network access point (connection 8, WAPs 3,4, Fig. 1) and is characterized in that it includes control means adapted:

- i) (Hagen groups terminals into at least two groups, one set of groupings being those MAC addresses who are located in the database, and those MAC addresses who are not located in the database. See [0052])
- ii) to allocate resources of said local area network to terminals attempting to establish communication therewith as a function of whether they are classified in said first group or said second group. ([0051], lines 1-3)

Regarding claims 2-3 and 29 as applied to claims 1 and 28 Hagen discloses:

 said control means are adapted to: determine the MAC address of each terminal attempting to establish communication with said local area network (Page 4, Col. 1, lines 7-9 disclose that the NAS retrieves the MAC address from the client from a packet.)

 and in that it includes means for allocating an IP address to the terminal having the MAC address determined in this way. ([0066] "The NAS router-related services preferably include ... DHCP/DHCP Relay services")

Regarding claims 4 and 30 as applied to claims 1-2 and 28-29, Hagen discloses:

 a memory for storing a table containing primary MAC addresses associated with first terminals adapted to exchange data frames encrypted in accordance with said format. (Page 4, Col. 1, Lines 9-12, the NAS inherently has memory for storing the database)

Regarding claims 5 and 31 and as applied to claims 1-2, 4 and 28-30, Hagen discloses:

 said table contains secondary MAC addresses associated with second terminals (8b) adapted to exchange unencrypted data frames. ([0050] describes how the MAC address is used to look up all of the permissions a terminal is allowed.)

Regarding claims 6 and 32 and as applied to claims 1-2, 4 and 28-30, Hagen discloses:

said control means (II) are adapted to determine if a MAC address extracted from a received frame is a primary or secondary MAC address and, if so, to send the allocation means (12) a request to allocate the terminal (8b) corresponding to said primary or secondary MAC address a primary IP address so that it can set up a link with at least one first remote network and one second remote network ([0158] If the mobile terminal's MAC address is found in the database, it obtains an IP address assignment for the mobile terminal, and can communicate on the private LAN or on the Internet)

and, if not, to send the allocation means (12) a request to allocate the terminal (8c) corresponding to said MAC address, referred to as a third terminal, a secondary IP address so that it can set up a connection with at least one second remote terminal. ([0052] if the MAC address is not located in any database, it is assigned a temporary IP address; [0158] If the mobile terminal's MAC address is found in the database, it obtains an IP address assignment for the mobile terminal. [0107] lines 27-28 state that unregistered users may be given some kind of network access, i.e. being allowed to connect to a second remote terminal)

Regarding claims 7 and 33 as applied to claims 1-2, 4 and 28-30, Hagen discloses:

 said first terminals are associated with said first remote network. (Note Fig. 13, where first terminals are private users 23)

Regarding claim 8 and 34 as applied to claims 1-2, 4, 7, 28-30 and 33 Hagen discloses:

 said terminals (8b) belong to known users of said first remote network. ([0107] states that one of the user terminal groupings is that of "home or local users" who are clients of the service providers private network, thus, the terminal belongs to a user of the first remote network.)

Regarding claims 9 and 35 as applied to claims 1-2, 4, 6, 28-30, and 32

Hagen discloses:

 each first remote network is selected from the group comprising private networks, IP data networks, and public switched telephone networks (PSTN), and in that each second remote network is selected from the group comprising IP data networks and public switched telephone networks (PSTN). (Fig. 13, Note the private LAN, the PSTN and the internet, an IP network)

Regarding claims 10 and 36 as applied to claims 1 and 28, Hagen discloses:

 said control means (ii) are adapted to allocate at least two priority levels for allocation of resources of the local area network (WLAN) according to whether communications are encrypted in accordance with said chosen format or not. ([0097] BAM handles queuing between public access subscribers and private network clients, and also the allocation and throttling of bandwidth for public access subscribers and private network clients.)

Regarding claims 11 and 37 as applied to claims 1, 10, 28, and 36, Hagen discloses:

the MAC addresses in said table are stored in corresponding relationship to at least one priority level. (Fig. 2 shows the contents of the table, which can be different for each MAC address, included wherein is policy table 3500, which provides for items like Bandwidth Policy.)

Regarding claims 12 and 38 and as applied to claims 1, 10-11, 28, and 36-37,

Hagen discloses:

 said priority levels comprise at least one first priority level allocated to first terminals (8a) associated with primary MAC addresses and one second priority level allocated to second terminals (8b) associated with secondary MAC addresses. (it is disclosed that specifically public access subscribers and private network clients could have two separate levels of priority in [0097].)

Regarding claims 13 and 39 as applied to claims 1, 10-12, 28, and 36-38

Hagen discloses:

 said control means (ii) are adapted to allocate a third priority level for allocation of resources of the local area network to said third terminals (8c) setting up communications not encrypted in accordance with said chosen format and whose MAC address is not in said table. (Third terminals whose address are not in the table are allocated a priority, as shown in lines 5-8 as "unregistered users".)

Regarding claims 14 and 40 as applied to claims 1, 10-11, 28, and 36, Hagen discloses:

said priority levels apply at least to a bandwidth and said bandwidth decreases from the first level to the third level. ([0107] gives a greatest to least list of bandwidth allocation classes in lines 5-8.)

Regarding claims 15 and 41 as applied to claims 1, 10-11, 14, 28, 36, and 40,
Hagen discloses:

 said control means (ii) send said access point (I) data representative of said bandwidth assigned to a designated terminal (8) and said access point allocates the corresponding resources to said designated terminal. (In [0185], it is disclosed in lines 11-14 that if the NAS is not the router, the NAS must update the QoS parameters on the router.)

Regarding claims 16 and 42 as applied to claims 1, 10, 28, 36, and 40-41,
Hagen discloses:

 said control means (ii) are adapted to modify an allocated priority level as a function of the available resources of said local area network (WLAN). (Page 12 Col 2, lines 15-20)

Regarding claim 21 and as applied to claim 1, Hagen discloses:

 A router, characterized in that it includes a processing server according to claim 1. (In [0185] lines 11-12, states "If the NAS is not the router...", which implies that the NAS can be a router.)

Regarding claim 22 and as applied to claim 1, Hagen discloses:

A local area network access point, characterized in that it includes a processing server according to claim 1. ([0054] discloses that the NAS may be implemented as a stand-alone device or as part of a WAP)

Regarding claim 23 and as applied to claim 1, Hagen discloses:

A communication installation including at least one local area network accessible via at least one access point, at least one first remote network, and at least one second remote network, which installation is characterized in that it includes a processing server according to claim 1 connected to said access point and to said first and second remote networks. (See Fig. 1, Note that LAN 10 is accessible via the NAS from the access point; note that the NAS is connected to the access point and the Internet and the Telephone ISDN/PSTN).

Regarding claim 25 and as applied to claim 23, Hagen discloses:

said processing server is connected to said first remote network via a virtual private network. (In [0217] and [0218] Hagen discloses that the connection to other networks may be encrypted using IPSec, or IPSec tunnels (i.e. VPN).)

Regarding claim 26 and as applied to claim 23, Hagen discloses:

said processing server is connected to said first remote network via a remote access server. (In [0217] and [0218] Hagen discloses that the connection to other networks may be enabled by RADIUS or DIAMETER (i.e. remote access services, which would need a remote access server to connect to).)

Regarding claim 27 and as applied to claim 23, Hagen discloses:

each first remote network is chosen from the group comprising private networks, IP data networks, and public switched telephone networks (PSTN) and in that each second remote network is selected from the group comprising IP data networks and public switched telephone networks (PSTN). (See Fig. 1, the internet is an IP network, and the PSTN is a PSTN network.)

Regarding **claim 43 as applied to claim 28**, Hagen discloses:

Use of a method according to claim 28 in communication networks selected from the group comprising PSTN, PLMN and Internet (IP) public networks and PABX private networks and private communication gateways.

Regarding **claim 44 as applied to claims 28 and 43**, Hagen discloses:

Use according to claim 43, characterized in that the PLMN public networks are mobile networks selected from the group comprising GSM, GPRS and UMTS networks.

Therefore, Hagen discloses all the limitations of claims 1-16, 21-23, and 27-42 except for the terminals being classified according to their ability to use encryption.

The general concept of classifying network clients according to their security traits is well known in the art as taught by Schneider (which teaches in Col 10 lines 6-34 that in order for a client to be able to access a network resource it must meet or exceed the trust (or encryption) level of that resource).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hagen with the teaching of terminals being classified according to

their security traits as taught by Schneider in order to make the system more scalable (Schneider, Col. 5 line 66).

12. Claims 17-20 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hagen and Schneider as applied to claims 1 and 23 above, and further in view of Comer, "Internetworking with TCP/IP Vol. 1".

Regarding claims 17-18,

Hagen discloses that The NAS includes components necessary to connect to the network, including a third conventional network interface provided for connecting to the private network (LAN) 10. ([0062] lines 7-16)

Hagen and Schneider disclose all of the limitations of claims 17-18 except that a cabled interface is used as the third conventional network interface; and in specific, Ethernet.

The general concept of using a cabled Ethernet network interface to a LAN is well known in the art as taught by Comer. (see page 20, under heading 2.4, "Ethernet has become the most popular LAN technology", also note Fig. 2.1 which shows a cable that can be used to implement Ethernet).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the network access control system of Hagen and Schneider to include the general concept of using a cabled Ethernet network interface as taught by Comer in order to be compatible with most private networks.

Regarding claims 19-20,

Hagen discloses that radio link technology used in the system disclosed is based upon IEEE 802.11b. ([0039] lines 1-2)

Hagen and Schneider disclose all the limitations of claims 19 and 20 except that a radio link is used to interface with the LAN.

The general concept of wirelessly accessing a LAN is well known in the art as taught by Comer. (Section 2.11.5 teaches that a wide variety of radio link equipment is available to create wireless LANs.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the network access control system of Hagen and Schneider to include the general concept of using a radio link network interface as taught by Comer in order to be compatible with more private networks.

Regarding **claim 24**,

Hagen and Schneider disclose all the limitations of claim 24 except that said local area network is a wireless local area network.

The general concept of a LAN being wireless is well-known in the art as taught by Comer (Section 2.11.5 teaches the possibility of creating a wireless LAN).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the network access control system of Hagen and Schneider to include the general concept of a LAN being wireless as taught by Comer in order to service a more diverse set of private LANs.

13. Claims 43-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hagen and Schneider.

Regarding **claims 43-44**,

Hagen and Schneider discloses all the limitations of claims 43-44 as cited above except for specific use of the method in PSTN, PLMN, IP, and PABX private networks and private communication gateways.

The general concept of limiting access to networks is well-known in the art, and PSTN, PLMN, IP, and PABX private networks and private communication gateways are well-known networks in the art, and that GSM, GPRS, and UMTS are well-known types of PLMN networks and official notice is taken as such.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the network access limiting method of Hagen and Schneider with the fact that PSTN, PLMN, IP, and PABX private networks and private communication gateways are networks that may need to have access limited in order to secure a more diverse group of networks.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael E. Keefer whose telephone number is (571) 270-1591. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8am-5pm, second Fridays 8am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frantz Jules can be reached on (571) 270-1808. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MEK 1/10/2007

FRANTZ JULES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

